

Proposed Upper Deschutes Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement

BLM
Prineville District Office

January 2005

Volume 2 – Chapters 4 and 5 and
Summary of Public Comments



Public Lands USA: Use, Share, Appreciate

Introduction

In the fall of 2000, the Prineville District Bureau of Land Management (BLM) reinitiated the Upper Deschutes Resource Management Plan (UDRMP) Environmental Impact Statement (formerly the Urban Interface EIS) in an effort to respond to growing concerns over the expanding and changing needs of the urban interface areas. The RMP will revise needed sections of the Brothers/La Pine RMP and the Two Rivers RMP in response to changing issues identified through consultation and coordination with interested and affected groups and individuals. This chapter includes a brief description of the process used during the preparation of the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statement and Resource Management Plan to keep people informed about and involved in the decision process.

Information Sharing

Public Notices

Federal Register

A Notice of Intent (NOI) was published in the Federal Register in 1995. The announcement contained a request for comments on concerns over managing public lands, and issues to be addressed in the RMP. The Notice of Availability of the Draft EIS was published in the Federal Register in October 2003.

Plan Updates

The BLM also prepared periodic plan updates that were posted to the website and mailed to the entire UDRMP mailing list. Eight updates were mailed between January 2002 and July 2004. News releases were sent to a list of about 40 media contacts, and subsequently broadcast on local television and radio stations, and printed in local newspapers.

Published Documents

Analysis of the Management Situation

In October 2001, the Analysis of the Management Situation (AMS) was published. The document identified preliminary issues based on internal meetings of BLM specialists and managers, meetings with tribal and local government representatives, calls and letters from the general public received over the previous ten years, and public scoping meetings conducted during earlier attempts to amend the existing RMP. Comments on the AMS served as a resource for members of the Issue Team during the collaborative process. The AMS also included an Issue Team Application and an invitation to participate in the collaborative planning process.

Draft Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement

The Draft Upper Deschutes RMP/EIS was published in October 2003.

Public Meetings & Field Tours

During the scoping / comment period for the AMS, public meetings were held in Redmond on October 16, 2001, in Prineville on October 17, 2001, and in La Pine on October 18, 2001. These meetings were advertised in local newspapers, and in the cover letter on the AMS (mailed to about 1,200 people in October 2001). The BLM also held public field tours to various sites of interest within the planning area as part of the scoping process. These field trips took place on October 20, 2001 in the area west of the Powell Butte Highway; on October 21, 2001 in the La Pine area; and on October 27, 2001 in the area east of the Powell Butte Highway.

Another round of meetings was held in November 2003 after publication of the Draft RMP / EIS to provide information to the public, answer questions, and facilitate public comments. These meetings were held November 12 in La Pine, November 18 in Prineville, November 19 in Redmond, and November 20 in Bend. There were also two meetings specifically to answer questions for the grazing permittees, in the morning and in the evening on November 13.

There were numerous other meetings open to the public, including Provincial Advisory Committee and Issue Team meetings (see further discussion of these meetings below under Collaborative Planning, BLM Process).

Web Site

A web site for the Upper Deschutes Resource Management Plan (UDRMP) process has been maintained since publication of the AMS. The site includes links to copies of the AMS, Draft RMP / EIS, the public meeting schedule, meeting notes, and results of a social survey conducted by the University of Oregon as part of the planning process.

Collaborative Planning

BLM Process

The proximity of BLM-administered lands to local communities increases use demands and the need for partnerships and coordination to provide for multiple needs and reduce conflicts. Public and other government participation during this planning process occurred mainly in a community-based framework. This process included using groups chartered specifically for this process, as well as including other separate but related governmental collaborative processes like the South Redmond Collaborative Planning Group.

The collaborative process was designed to put governments and citizens together to resolve the significant planning issues. See Table 5-1 for a list of key public involvement events. The following groups contributed to the planning effort in a variety of ways:

Intergovernmental Cooperators

Includes federal, state and local governmental cooperators who provided special information or expertise in preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement, or who have jurisdictions overlapping or contiguous to BLM-administered public land.

Deschutes Provincial Advisory Committee (PAC) & PAC Subcommittee

This is a committee formally chartered under the Federal Advisory Committee Act to provide a broad representation of interests to advise federal land managers within the Deschutes Province. A subcommittee of the PAC was assigned to act on behalf of the full PAC during this process. The PAC recommended that BLM develop the range of alternatives that included Alternatives 1-6, and then go forward with consensus recommendations from the Issue Team (see below). The PAC holds quarterly meetings open to the public. The PAC membership list can be found in Table 5-2.

Issue Team

Issue teams are working groups chartered by the PAC to focus on specific planning issues. The Issue Teams included representatives of the general public, specific interest groups, permit holders, other stakeholders, and intergovernmental representatives. The Issue Team membership list is in Table 5-3.

Issue Subcommittee

The Issue Team broke into eight smaller teams which focused on clarifying issues and developing alternatives around specific issue categories. These teams met frequently to develop concepts around which the alternatives were designed. All Issue Team meetings were open to the public.

Preferred Alternative Subcommittee

After the descriptions of the range of alternatives were completed by the BLM, the Issue Team was again reorganized to focus on evaluating the range of alternatives and developing areas of consensus on a preferred alternative. For that process, the Issue Team was arranged into five smaller groups based on the interests each member identified early in the process. In some cases, these groups were similar to those organized around the issue categories. These teams rated and ranked the interest categories, rated the alternatives according to the categories, and selected members to act on their behalf to work on consensus on a Preferred Alternative. The results of the subcommittee work were returned to the full Issue Team. The larger group finalized the Preferred Alternative consensus recommendation that was forwarded to the PAC and subsequently to the BLM.

The Preferred Alternative Subcommittee reconvened after the DEIS public comment period ended to review the comments and determine where the group was in agreement on how to respond to the comments. The group then helped revise the Preferred Alternative to reflect areas of consensus. These changes were forwarded to the PAC for approval. The PAC approved all changes and forwarded them to the BLM with a letter of commendation on the process.

Other Collaborative Processes

In addition to the process designed for the Upper Deschutes Resource Management Plan, the BLM also participates in other related interagency efforts to address community needs such as public land uses, ownership, transportation, and healthy watersheds. A brief summary of some of the more directly related on-going efforts and their relationship to this Resource Management Plan are described below.

South Redmond Collaborative Planning Group

The Governor of Oregon sponsors a state-wide Community Solutions Team composed of various state agency representatives and charged with collaboratively solving problems of growth and development. This team recognized the potential for problems associated with different, and sometimes ambiguous or conflicting missions of federal, state, and local governments related to the growth of Redmond. They assembled representatives from the BLM, OMD, ODOT, DLCD, Deschutes County, and the City to discuss the potential conflicts and demands and seek solutions that could, among other things, form the basis for some parts of the alternatives that would be evaluated by the BLM in the EIS. A key component of the collaboration process was the ability to combine evaluation and decision processes between agencies, thus saving substantial money, time, and resources needed to finalize important regional growth and development decisions.

The South Redmond Collaborative Planning Group provided a forum for developing alternatives to resolve regional transportation issues between Bend and Redmond, around the Redmond Airport, and community needs for public lands adjacent to the City of Redmond. These components were reviewed and subsequently included in the range of alternatives and in the consensus recommendation on the Preferred Alternative.

City of Redmond Urban Reserve Study

The City of Redmond is completing a 50-year urban reserve study to predict buildable lands needed to meet expected state requirements. The BLM is participating in this process and used early calculations of “expected need” to identify lands available for community expansion in several alternatives, including the Preferred.

Prineville Reservoir Resource Management Plan and State Park Master Plan

The USDI Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) and the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department have recently completed a management plan to guide recreation and resource use within the Prineville Reservoir area. This lies within the planning area, but is on land withdrawn from BLM jurisdiction. BLM representatives participated on the Ad Hoc Work Group and Technical Teams for the Prineville Reservoir EA, and representatives from the BOR also participated on the Issue Team during this process to ensure that the plans would have consistent management direction where necessary.

Sub-basin and Water Quality Restoration Planning

BLM is participating in several newly begun or ongoing Deschutes basin evaluation efforts that have and will continue to contribute important information to the Resource Management Plan. These include the joint Water Quality Restoration Project for the Upper and Little Deschutes sub-basins, the Northwest Power Planning Council sub-basin planning process, and the in-stream flow assessment for the lower Crooked River. These are ongoing collaborations between government agencies such as the Forest Service, BLM, and USGS, as well as between local non-profit organizations like the Upper Deschutes and Crooked River Watershed Councils, and the Deschutes Resources Conservancy.

Millican-West Butte Road

Legislation provided Crook and Deschutes counties rights-of-way for the West Butte Road, (BLM Road 6520). A new paved road utilizing this route was completed in June 2004. The development of this route, in combination with the existing paved Millican Road, links Prineville to Highway 20. The BLM was involved as the counties planned and constructed the road.

Table 5–1. Key Public Involvement Events

Date	Event summary
1/12/01	All Issue Team meeting
4/11/01	Deschutes Province Advisory Committee (PAC)
6/20/01	PAC meeting
9/21/01	PAC meeting
10/01	Analysis of the Management Situation published and mailed
10/16/01	Public meeting, Redmond
10/17/01	Public meeting, Prineville
10/18/01	Public meeting, La Pine
10/20/01	Public tour, area west of Powell Butte Highway
10/21/01	Public tour, La Pine area
10/27/01	Public tour, area east of Powell Butte Highway
12/10/01	Issue Team meeting – Land Uses
12/10/01	Issue Team meeting – Recreation
12/11/01	Issue Team meeting – Land Ownership
12/11/01	Issue Team meeting – Ecosystem
12/14/01	Issue Team meeting – Transportation & Access
12/14/01	Issue Team meeting – Public Health & Safety
1/7/02	Issue Team meeting – Land Uses
1/7/02	Issue Team meeting – Transportation & Access
1/9/02	Issue Team meeting – Land Ownership
1/9/02	Issue Team meeting – Ecosystem
1/14/02	Issue Team meeting – Public Health & Safety
1/14/02	Issue Team meeting – Recreation
1/16/02	PAC meeting
1/17/02	Issue Team meeting – Archaeology
1/29/02	All Issue Team meeting
1/31/02	Issue Team meeting – Ecosystem
2/1/02	Issue Team meeting – Land Ownership
2/4/02	Issue Team meeting – Transportation & Access
2/5/02	Issue Team meeting – Public Health & Safety
2/6/02	Issue Team meeting – Archaeology
2/11/02	Issue Team meeting – Land Uses
2/13/02	Issue Team meeting – Social/Economics
2/25/02	Issue Team meeting – Transportation & Access
2/26/02	Issue Team meeting – Public Health & Safety
2/27/02	Issue Team meeting – Archaeology
3/1/02	Issue Team meeting – Ecosystem
3/6/02	Issue Team meeting – Archaeology
3/11/02	Issue Team meeting – Land Uses
3/13/02	Issue Team meeting – Land Ownership
5/13/02	Issue Team meeting – Land Uses
5/14/02	Issue Team meeting – Public Health & Safety
5/15/02	Issue Team meeting – Archaeology
5/16/02	Issue Team meeting – Recreation
5/17/02	Issue Team meeting – Public Health & Safety
5/17/02	Issue Team meeting – Social/Economics
5/20/02	Issue Team meeting – Ecosystem
5/21/02	Issue Team meeting – Transportation & Access
5/22/02	Issue Team meeting – Land Ownership
5/28/02	Issue Team meeting – Land Uses
6/19/02	PAC meeting
6/21/02	All Issue Team meeting
9/11/02	PAC meeting
11/26/02	Issue Team meeting – Social/Economics
12/10/02	All Issue Team meeting
2/11/03	All Issue Team meeting
2/25/03	Preferred Alternative Subcommittee meeting
3/4/03	Preferred Alternative Subcommittee meeting
3/11/03	Preferred Alternative Subcommittee meeting
3/14/03	PAC meeting

3/17/03	Preferred Alternative Subcommittee meeting
3/20/03	Preferred Alternative Subcommittee meeting
4/1/03	All Issue Team meeting
6/11/03	PAC meeting
10/2003	Draft RMP/EIS published and mailed
3/16/04	All Issue Team meeting
3/16/04	Preferred Alternative Subcommittee meeting
4/13/04	Preferred Alternative Subcommittee meeting
4/14/04	Preferred Alternative Subcommittee meeting
4/15/04	Preferred Alternative Subcommittee meeting
4/15/04	Preferred Alternative Subcommittee meeting
4/19/04	Preferred Alternative Subcommittee meeting
4/19/04	Preferred Alternative Subcommittee meeting
4/20/04	Preferred Alternative Subcommittee meeting
4/20/04	Preferred Alternative Subcommittee meeting
4/22/04	Preferred Alternative Subcommittee meeting
4/27/04	Preferred Alternative Subcommittee meeting
4/27/04	Preferred Alternative Subcommittee meeting
4/29/04	Preferred Alternative Subcommittee meeting
4/29/04	Preferred Alternative Subcommittee meeting
5/4/04	Preferred Alternative Subcommittee meeting
5/6/04	Preferred Alternative Subcommittee meeting
5/17/04	All Issue Team meeting
6/21/04	PAC meeting

Table 5-2. Deschutes Provincial Advisory Committee (PAC)

Last Name	First Name	Interest	Organization
Achterman	Gail	At Large Representative	Deschutes Resource Conservancy
Ardt*	Glen	State Agency	Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife
Burley	Chuck	Forest Products	Burley & Associates, LLC
Carlson	Dennis	At Large Representative	Hood River County Department of Forestry
Chaudet*	Mollie	Federal Agencies (BLM/USFS)	Province Liaison
Cordova*	Jerry	Federal Agency	US Fish & Wildlife Service
Erickson	Dan	County Government	Wasco County
Fowler	Brad	Forest Products	Fowler Timber Company
Gentry	Don	Tribal Government	Klamath Tribe
Gill*	Kent	Conservation/Preservation	Friends of The Metolius
Henrikson	Gerald	Federal Agency	Bureau of Indian Affairs
Lamb	Bonnie	State Agency	Dept of Environmental Quality
Leslie	Dave	County Government	Deschutes County Planning Dept
Lillebo*	Tim	Conservation/Preservation	Oregon Natural Resources Council
Mcclain	Dave	Mineral Industry	Private Consultant
Nelsen	Richard	Livestock Grazing on Federal Land	Rancher, BLM Grazing Permittee
Oliphant	Dennis	Recreation/Tourism	Sun Country Tours Inc.
Penhollow*	Clay	Tribal Government	Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs Reservation
Stecher	Christopher	Recreation/Tourism	Mt. Bachelor, Inc.
Thomas*	Sarah	County Government	Crook County Rep.
Towne	Robert	Federal Agency	BLM Field Manager
Tweten	Randy	Federal Agency	National Marine Fisheries Service
Weldon	Leslie A.C.	Federal Agency	Deschutes National Forest
Wickman*	Boyd	USFS Research	Pringle Falls Experimental Forest

* PAC subcommittee members have asterisk by last name.

Table 5-3. Issue Team Members

Last Name	First Name	Organization	City
Anderson	Jim		Sisters
Angell	Jim		Bend
Ardt	Glen	Oregon Dept of Fish & Wildlife	Bend
Babb	Geoff	Nature Conservancy of Oregon	Bend
Bell	Jeff	USFS, Ochoco National Forest	Prineville
Beraud	Bob	Bonneville Power Administration	Portland
Bird	Sally	Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs Reservation	Warm Springs
Boyer	Jeff		Bend
Brown	Dick	City of Prineville	Prineville
Burley	Chuck	Burley & Associates, LLC	Bend
Carlson	Merrie Sue	Government Office of The State of Oregon	Bend
Carlson	Scott	Hooker Creek Companies, LLC	Bend
Cooper	Scott	Crook County Courthouse	Prineville
Cordova		US Fish & Wildlife Service	Bend
Crume	Butch		La Pine
Davis	Randall	Oregon Dept of Transportation	Bend
Davison	Bob	Wildlife Management Institute	Bend
Deboodt	Tim	Crook County Extension Service	Prineville
Devoney	Mark	Oregon Dept of Transportation	Bend
Dufourd	Joani	Central Oregon Motorcycle & ATV Club	Bend
Duncan	Dave	Oregon Military Department	Salem
Eccles	Terry	Oregon Parks & Recreation	Salem
Egertson	Chris	Oregon Natural Desert Association	Bend
Elliott	Jerry	Oregon Military Department	Salem
Faulkner	Ed		Prineville
Fenty	Brent	Oregon Natural Desert Association	Bend
Ferry	Brian	Oregon Department Fish & Wildlife	Prineville
Florey	Ken		Bend
Fockler	Bill	Oregon Equestrian Trails & Central Oregon Shooting Sports Association	Bend
Forbes	John	La Pine Parks & Recreation District	La Pine
Frost	Russ	Oregon Dept of Transportation	Bend
Gilbert	Nancy	US Fish & Wildlife Service	Bend
Gill	Kent	Friends of The Metolius	Camp Sherman
Graves	Bob		Bend
Graves	Mimi		Bend
Gray	Susan	Archaeological Society of Central Oregon	Bend
Hammer	Katie	Central Oregon Parks & Recreation District	Redmond
Hartwell	Ray	Deschutes Resource Conservancy	Bend
Hensley	Jim	Crook County Undersheriff	Prineville
Hildebrandt	Jamie	Rock Springs Guest Ranch	Bend
Hiller	David		Sisters
Hinman	Rick	Central Electric Co-op, Inc	Redmond
Holmes	Matt		Bend

Last Name	First Name	Organization	City
Holmquist	Anne		Redmond
Hunt	Bruce	Central Electric Cooperative	Redmond
Jinings	Jon	Dept of Land Conservation & Development	Bend
Johnson	Jerry	Our Public Properties	La Pine
Johnson	Libby	Department of Energy, Bonneville Power Assoc.	The Dalles
Jorgensen	Steve	Deschutes County Community Development	Bend
Kachlein	Belinda		Bend
Keller	Alan	Crook County Landfill	Prineville
Kimball	Kate		Bend
Lamb	Bonnie	Dept of Environmental Quality	Bend
Lillebo	Tim	Oregon Natural Resources Council	Bend
Lonsdale	Sandy	Juniper Group Sierra Club	Bend
Malarkey	Didi		Eugene
McCaffrey	Bill	Oregon Military Department	Bend
McCaulou	Scott	Deschutes Resource Conservancy	Bend
McGraw	Chuck	City of Redmond	Redmond
McMullen	Chad	Hooker Creek Companies, LLC	Bend
Mcnight	Brett	Department of Environmental Quality	Bend
Miller	Larry	Oregon Parks & Recreation Department	Bend
Miller	Ron		Redmond
Moore	Ed	Oregon Department of Transportation	Bend
Morrow	Catherine	Deschutes County Planning Division	Bend
Norton	M L	Central Electric Cooperative	Redmond
Oliphant	Dennis	Sun Country Tours Inc.	Bend
Parsons	Cory	Crook County / OSU Extension	Prineville
Penhollow	Cary	Central Oregon Irrigation District	Redmond
Penhollow	Clay	Confederated Tribes Of Warm Springs Reservation	Warm Springs
Peterson	Bill	USDA Forest Service, Bend / Fort Rock	Bend
Pewther	John	Redmond Planning Commission	Redmond
Pieper	Barbara		Sisters
Pieper	Darrell		Sisters
Ponsford	Walter	Jefferson County	Madras
Ponte	George	Oregon Department of Forestry	Prineville
Quitmeier	Bob	City of Redmond	Redmond
Read	George	Deschutes County Planning Department	Bend
Sailors	Tammi	Central Oregon Irrigation Dist	Redmond
Schloer	Walt	USDA Forest Service, Bend / Fort Rock	Bend
Schonborn	Lyn		Bend
Schonneker	Chuck	North Unit Irrigation District	Madras
Singhose	Susan		Bend
Singhose	Wayne		Bend
Stewart	Jon	Deschutes National Forest	Bend
Stout	Doug		Bend
Strome	Darsie		Bend
Sutherland	Jo Anne	City of Redmond	Redmond
Thomas	Sarah	Crook County Representative	Prineville
Thomasberg	Paul		Bend

Last Name	First Name	Organization	City
Thorn	Bruce	Quail Valley Ranch	Salem
Tomjack	Tom & Mary		Bend
Tonsfeldt	Ward		Bend
Towe	Marie	Crooked River Ranch Riders Club	Crooked River Ranch
Unger	Alan	City of Redmond	Redmond
Van Vliet	Alan	Eagle Crest	Redmond
Wallace	Kerrie		Powell Butte
Whipple	Brigette	Confederated Tribes Warm Springs	Warm Springs
Wickman	Boyd	USDA Forest Service, Research	Bend
Winch	Martin		Bend
Wolfenbarger	Bob		Lebanon
Woolley	Laren	Empire Corp. Park	Bend
Yoder	Katy		Bend
Youtie	Berta		Prineville
Zakrajsek	Larry	Bureau of Reclamation	Bend
Zelenka	Bill	Crook County Planning Department	Prineville

Agencies and Organizations Consulted

The Prineville District BLM mailed the public scoping packet (AMS) to approximately 1,200 agencies, organizations, and individuals, and the DEIS to about 1,700. The Upper Deschutes proposed RMP/FEIS was sent to the current mailing list which now includes about 2,600 names of agencies, organizations and individuals. The following lists are representative of the entities on the mailing list:

Elected Officials

Bend City Council
 Crook County Representative
 Crook County Under sheriff
 Deschutes County Board of Commissioners
 Government Office of the State of Oregon
 Jefferson County Board of Commissioners
 Sisters City Council

Tribal Groups

Burns Paiute Tribe
 Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs
 Klamath Tribes

Cooperating Agencies

Barlow/Bear Springs Ranger District
 Bonneville Power Administration

Bureau of Reclamation
Central Electric Cooperative
Central Oregon Irrigation District
Central Oregon Irrigation District
Central Oregon Parks and Recreation District
City of Prineville
City of Redmond
City of Redmond Planning Department
Crook County Courthouse
Crook County Extension Service
Crook County Landfill
Crook County Planning Department
Department of Energy, BPA
Department of Environmental Quality
Department of Environmental Quality
Department of Land and Conservation Development
Deschutes County Community Development
Deschutes County Planning Division
Deschutes National Forest
Hood River County Forestry Department
Hood River Ranger District
Klamath County Extension Service
Klamath County Planning Department
National Marine Fisheries Service
North Unit Irrigation District
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Oregon Department of Forestry
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Division of State Lands
Oregon Military Department
Oregon Natural Desert Association
Oregon Parks and Recreation
State Historic Preservation Office
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
U.S. Forest Service, Bend-Fort Rock Ranger District
U.S. Forest Service, Deschutes National Forest Monitoring Program
U.S. Forest Service, Ochoco National Forest
USDE Bonneville Power Administration - EWP
Wasco County

Organizations/Businesses

Archaeological Society of Central Oregon
Burley & Associates, LLC
Central Electric Co-op, Inc.
Central Oregon Motorcycle and ATV Club
Central Oregon Partnership
Crooked River Ranch Riders Club
Deschutes Resource Conservancy
Eagle Crest
Empire Corporation Park
Fowler Timber
Friends of the Metolius
Hooker Creek Companies, LLC
La Pine Parks and Recreation District
Nature Conservancy of Oregon

Oregon Equestrian Trails
 Oregon Natural Resources Council
 Our Public Properties
 Quail Valley Ranch
 Rock Springs Guest Ranch
 Sierra Club, Juniper Group
 Sun Country Tours, Inc.
 Wildlife Management Institute

Others

Interested public not affiliated with an above-mentioned group
 Livestock grazing permittees
 Miscellaneous additional businesses
 Recreationists
 Special recreation permittees

Preparers

BLM Interdisciplinary Team

The following table (Table 5-4) contains, in alphabetical order, the primary members of the Prineville District Interdisciplinary Team who were responsible for the preparation of this document. Following the table are lists of other District and State Office personnel who assisted in the preparation and/or review of this document.

Table 5-4. Interdisciplinary Team for Upper Deschutes Resource Management Plan

Name and Title	Education	Experience
Keith Brown <i>Outdoor Recreation Planner</i>	B.S. Natural Resource Economics, University of Vermont; M.S. Recreation Resources, Colorado State University	Prineville District Recreation Planner for past 2 years. Over 10 years seasonal recreation work experience in the non-profit, for-profit, and government sectors.
Geoff Babb <i>Fire Ecologist</i>	M.S. Watershed Management, University of Arizona; B.A. Biology, Western Washington University	In current position since July 2004. Participated on UDRMP for previous two years while employed with The Nature Conservancy (TNC) as Fire Mgmt. Officer. Twenty five years experience with TNC, BLM, USFS, and Washington Dept. Natural Resources.
Steve Castillo <i>Forester</i>	B.S. Forest Management Oregon State University	U.S. Forest Service (1977-1992). BLM (1992-present). Current duties: All aspects of forest management with emphasis on ecosystem restoration, hazardous fuels treatment, and small diameter timber harvest.
Mollie Chaudet <i>Project Manager, Upper Deschutes RMP</i>	A.S., Forest Technology, Central Oregon Community College.	Twenty years of experience with the Forest Service. Environmental Coordinator and National Environmental Analysis Instructor, 1990-present; Project Planner, 1982-1989. Timber Sale Preparation 1978-1981.
Lisa Clark <i>Writer/Editor</i>	M.F.S. Conservation Biology/Wildlife Ecology, Yale University; B.A. Journalism, minor in English, University of Oregon.	13 years with BLM, in fire suppression/Rx burning, wildlife, recreation, and writing/editing. Three years with the Forest Service as wildlife biologist and writer/editor. Adjunct Instructor, Univ. of Oregon, General Science Program (2000 - present). Contractor on Content Analysis Team (public comments on Upper Deschutes DEIS).

Name and Title	Education	Experience
G. Scott Currie <i>Recreation Planner</i>	M.L.A Landscape Architecture, Cal Poly Pomona; B.S. Natural Resource Management, Cal Poly San Luis Obispo.	Recreation planner for Prineville District BLM 1999 – present. 10 years experience as Landscape Architect/Recreation Planner with USFS and USDA-NRCS. 10 years experience as Landscape Architect/Recreation Planner with EDAW, Inc.
William I. Dean <i>Wildlife Biologist</i>	B.S. Wildlife Biology, Colorado State University; Associate in Science, Finger Lakes Community College.	Bureau of Land Management (1990-2003) Currently wildlife biologist for the Deschutes Resource Area.
Jimmy Eisner <i>Fisheries Biologist</i>	B.S. Fisheries, Humboldt State University.	Fish Biologist for Prineville District BLM 1991 – present.
Ryan Franklin <i>Geologist</i>	B.S. Geology, University of Oregon.	Seasonal wilderness ranger (1995-1996) and seasonal hydrological technician (1997) for the USFS. Seasonal interpretive ranger (2001) for the BLM. Currently a geologist and writer/editor for the BLM. Duties include minerals planning and inventory of rock collecting sites.
Ron Gregory <i>Deschutes Resource Area Archaeologist</i>	B.A. and M.A., Applied Anthropology, Oregon State University.	Positions held as archaeologist with the USFS and BLM with responsibilities for locating, researching, and documenting historic properties and heritage resources and planning for their preservation and appropriate uses.
Ron Halvorson <i>Natural Resource Specialist & Botanist</i>	B.S. Animal Science, Cal Poly San Luis Obispo; M.S. Renewable Resources Management, University of Nevada, Reno.	Range Conservationist BLM (1974 - 1984), District Botanist Prineville District BLM (1985 - present). Responsible for implementation of special status plant and Research Natural Area programs, and policy oversight of Area of Critical Environmental Concern program.
Douglas D. Kile <i>GIS Coordinator UDRMP/ Deschutes Resource Area</i>	Associates Degree in Drafting (1982), Treasure Valley Community College.	Coordinate and provide GIS analysis and cartographic needs for issue teams and resource area specialists. Previously employed as GIS assistant on the Prairie City Ranger District and Malheur National Forest Supervisors Office.
Michelle McSwain <i>Hydrologist</i>	Masters in Forest Hydrology, Oregon State University; BA Geology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.	District hydrologist for Vale District BLM 1987-1989; Zone Hydrologist for Willamette National Forest 1989-1997; Hydrologist for Prineville District BLM 1997-present. Duties include district watershed program lead, water quality, riparian, stream channel, and aquatic habitat management.
Phil Paterno <i>Appraiser/Realty Specialist</i>	B.S. Plant and Soil Science, State Certified General Appraiser.	Duties include the valuation of land and interests, and the processing of land exchanges, acquisitions, sales and other realty related cases.
Teal Purrington <i>Rangeland Management Specialist</i>	M.S. Rangeland Resources, Oregon State University B.A. Biology, University of California, Santa Cruz	In current position since 1991. Duties include managing livestock grazing and providing input on management of other public land uses to preserve and enhance forage and other rangeland resources. Served as Content Analysis Team Coordinator for public comments on Upper Deschutes DEIS.
Sue Stewart <i>Fire Ecologist</i>	M.S. Natural Resource Management, Fire Ecology, University of Idaho. B.S. Forest Management, Oregon State University.	Various fire management positions with US Forest Service and BLM since 1987. Fire Ecologist for Prineville BLM and Deschutes and Ochoco National Forests 99-03. Currently Applied Fire Ecologist with Washington Office USFS.
Lawrence C. Thomas <i>Environmental Protection Specialist</i>	B.S Soil Science and Biology, Cal Poly Pomona.	Soil Scientist USDI BIA 1975-1977, Soil Scientist USDI BLM 1977-1992, Environmental Protection Specialist USDI BLM 1992 to present.
Michael Williams <i>Writer/Editor</i>	PhD. Sociology, University of California, Santa Barbara.	Writer Editor for USDA Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management, 1992 to Present.
Ron Wortman <i>Realty Specialist</i>	B.S. Business and Cartography, Eastern Oregon College.	Realty Specialist for Prineville District for nine years. Duties include preparation of sales, exchanges, recreation and public purposes applications, rights-of-way, and leases and permits.

options that could be implemented and altered on a case-by-case basis. However, the DEIS appears to present the restriction of operational hours as a mandatory mitigation measure. Hours of operation as well as days and buffer widths should be site specific and negotiable depending on the site, project needs and the potential for conflict with other uses. ODOT would suggest that these rules be identified as guidelines and be included in Volume 3 on Page 314, under Operating Procedures. (Oregon Dept of Transportation, Bend, OR - #261)

Response: The Draft EIS provided for exceptions to the hourly and daily restrictions on mining in Volume 2, page 86. However, language was added to the FEIS to clarify that these restrictions are guidelines that will be applied on a case-by-case basis. There is a statement that reads, "These operating and blasting guidelines would be applied through site-specific environmental review on a case by case basis."

86. The RMP should provide more access for locatable mineral prospectors.

I saw very little in your reports that provided access to the prospector which is covered by the 1872 mining act. Even if there is not much activity taking place at this time, it does not mean that it won't. (Individual, LaPine, OR - #236)

Response: Almost 100 percent of the planning area is available for locatable mineral entry under the 1872 mining laws in all alternatives. Only the 510-acre Powell Butte RNA has been withdrawn from locatable mineral entry.

87. The RMP should reduce the amount of public lands available for mineral material site development because there will be too much impact from the access roads.

Keeping open 85% of the land area for mineral extraction (including ODOT needs) is not at all a good idea. Think of all the roads that will be built almost anywhere including the introduction of noxious weeds by the users of these access roads! (Individual, Bend, OR - #35)

Response: Most BLM-administered lands within the Planning Area are either too far from likely construction sites or do not have rock of sufficient rock quality to be developed. It is expected, based on demand and current areas of interest that 3-4 new mineral material sites will be developed with up to 1 mile of new access road constructed for each site. Up to 80 acres (less than 1 percent of the planning area) of ground disturbance can be expected from development of these sites if they occur.

88. The RMP should prohibit mineral material site development where residents would be adversely affected...

because of the impacts of existing operations.

On the issue of Land Uses, I have a real problem with the unmitigated and arrogant appearance of gravel pit operations in my area. Though these operations are located on private property, they access these sites through BLM managed lands. Adjoining BLM managed lands are likely to be leased to facilitate these operations. Just the thought of more trucks, dust, noise and asphalt smells destroys the vision of Central Oregon's past and gives us a bitter taste of what the future will bring. I oppose expansion of existing pits, and hope that new locations (far from public residential and recreational areas) be permitted very carefully and with full public input. (Individual, Redmond, OR - #122)

because the truck traffic is dangerous.

We are contacting you in regards to the proposed gravel pit on Barr Rd. We would like to let you know we vehemently oppose this site for the pit. One of the many reasons is the

environmental impact on the land around the site; on the animals as well as human. The proximity to residential areas is frightening, as we have numerous animals, and we are having our first child soon. The sheer amount of traffic would be very dangerous. Barr Rd is heavily used by horseback riders, recreational enthusiasts, as well, many people walk/jog either with or without their children. Surely you can see how dangerous a heavily traveled road with giant trucks would be. Please know that [the Barr Road] pit would negatively impact the life of all Barr Road residents, as well Gerking Mkt road. Our property values would drop, and the toxicity of the trucks and the production of the aggregate would greatly harm humans and animals alike. We do not want our quality of life destroyed to placate ODOT. We don't see this site as a logical one seeing as there is another option. (Individual, Bend, OR - #1328)

because property values would be adversely affected.

We are contacting you in regards to the proposed gravel pit on Barr Rd. We would like to let you know we vehemently oppose this site for the pit. We moved here recently, and did so because of privacy. That would be destroyed as well our property values would plummet. (Individual, Bend, OR - #1328)

because existing mineral material sources are more than enough to meet demand.

The McClain and Associates study revealed that there is ten times more road aggregate than is needed for the next fifty years already available in existing gravel pits. With this in mind we feel that a beautiful area such as Cline Buttes should not be impacted with a gravel pit. (Individual, Bend, OR - #299)

***Response:** The Cline Buttes area has been identified as having high quality rock suitable for use as aggregate. The area is also situated within economic hauling distance of three major highways (Highways 126, 20, and 97). The combination of high quality rock and economic hauling distance is not a frequent occurrence in Central Oregon. In addition, existing aggregate reserves may not lie within economic hauling distance of planned construction projects in the Cline Buttes area. Due to economic factors and the importance of aggregate for building and maintaining infrastructure, a complete closure of the Cline Buttes area to aggregate mining would not represent a reasonable balance of uses.*

Note that the final PRMP would not authorize any specific mining operation in the Cline Buttes area. An application must be submitted to BLM before developing a new site on any BLM-administered lands. All new proposals are subject to an environmental analysis including notification of the interested and affected public and opportunities for public comment. If a site proposal is approved, guidelines and stipulations to mitigate conflicts with residents would be developed. For example, stipulations may restrict operations to certain hours of the day and may not allow operations on weekends. These site-specific mitigations would be considered at the time an application was submitted for a given site. Please refer to the minerals section of the DEIS/FEIS (DEIS pages 85-86, 197) for the stipulations and guidelines that are common to Alternatives 2-7. These stipulations and guidelines are based in part on local county regulations.

89. The RMP should further restrict mineral material site development in areas with a wildlife and recreation emphasis.

We are particularly concerned with ODOT's request to be granted a road aggregate extraction site in the Cline Buttes Area. As Central Oregon's population continues to grow the need for open spaces to recreate will increase exponentially. The Cline Buttes area because of the close proximity to both Bend and Redmond is especially valuable for recreation. (Individual, Bend, OR - #299)

We disagree with the recommendations of Alternative 7 for resource use [in the Northwest planning area]. To support the wildlife and recreation emphasis, we

recommend no grazing, timber harvesting, or mineral extraction in this area. (Individual, Sisters, OR - #1326)

***Response:** The DEIS/FEIS identifies the areas that are available for mineral material site development but does not authorize any specific mining operation. An application must be submitted to BLM before developing a new site on BLM-administered lands. All new proposals are subject to an environmental analysis including notification of the interested and affected public and opportunities for public comment. If a site proposal is approved, guidelines and stipulations to mitigate conflicts with recreation and wildlife management objectives would be developed. Completely closing an area to mineral material site development because of a wildlife and/or recreation emphasis does not represent a reasonable balance of multiple-uses.*

90. The RMP should require mineral material truck traffic to exit the Cline Buttes area via Highway 126.

The other site proposed [for a gravel pit] on 126 is a much better option [than the Barr Road site]. It would not impact a residential area. Also, proposing to run the trucks on Barr Road even if the site is on 126 is a very [poor] idea for the aforementioned reasons [safety / environmental]. I have also been informed that a study was done on the necessity of another gravel pit and that the findings were such that there is ten times enough gravel for the next fifty years at the current sites. (Individual, Bend, OR - #1328))

If a gravel extraction site is unavoidable we feel that due to the relatively high population density on both Barr Road and Gerking Market Road the only remotely acceptable and safe location for aggregate extraction site in the Cline Buttes area would be Site N. Site N would only be acceptable and not pose an unreasonable risk to public safety if entry and exiting is only allowed via Highway 126. Highway 126 is designed, constructed and maintained to accommodate heavy truck and semi truck traffic with full width lanes and wide shoulders. Neither Barr Road nor Gerking Market Road were constructed nor intended for the heavy semi truck traffic that would result from access being allowed from these roads. Barr Road and Gerking Market Road are barely wide enough for two pickup trucks at the same time. There are several school bus stops on Barr Road and Gerking Market Road. Heavy gravel truck traffic on these relatively narrow roads would be nothing short of endangering our children. (Individual, Bend, OR - #299)

***Response:** The FEIS identifies the areas that may be available for mineral material site development and provides general management guidelines for some standardized mechanisms to help mitigate mineral development conflicts with residents. Under the Preferred Alternative mineral material sales may not be located within 1/8 mile of residentially zoned areas. In addition, roads that feed from BLM-administered land into residentially zoned areas may be used for mining-related traffic only if alternate routes are not available. Refer to the minerals section in the DEIS/FEIS for a more detailed discussion of the standardized guidelines that are Common to Alternatives 2-7. The guidelines related to minimum setback distances are based, in part, on county ordinances as well.*

However, it is important to note that the RMP would not authorize any specific mining operation. An application must be submitted to BLM before developing a new site on BLM-administered lands. All new proposals are subject to an environmental analysis including notification of the interested and affected public and opportunities for public comment. If a site proposal is approved, guidelines and stipulations to mitigate conflicts with residents would be developed. Stipulations may include truck travel restrictions on roads under BLM jurisdiction.

91. The RMP should increase the mineral material buffer around residentially zoned areas.

Once again, because of the extensive aggregate use in the O'Neil area we are also dealing with the noise issue. This is also a very sensitive issue for the surrounding neighborhood. The heavy equipment used to mine the aggregate is noisy, and dusty, the rock crushers are noisy, and dusty, the processors are noisy, and dusty, the loaders are very noisy, and dusty, plus the trucks driving in and out, out and in, and up and down, down and up the O'Neil highway. The addition of the military gunfire along with the driving of military vehicles in and around that particular BLM property would cause a noise issue. We already have a noise issue with the current aggregate mining in this area and are not able to tolerate anymore of the same. The gun club, which is located to the south of the BLM property in question, can be clearly heard by all of the property owners in this area. What would added military gunfire do for the peace and quiet that we all thought we were purchasing when we moved into this area? Just how is the 1/8-mile buffer going to eliminate this possibility when this gun club is several miles away? (Individual, Redmond, OR - #52)

What would moving the military into the upper portion of Redmond accomplish as far as abolishing the conflict with the surrounding residences? What is fair about this move? Why would BLM think that the surrounding neighborhood of Redmond would not mind having both the aggregate mining operations and the military operations within that area? What makes this area any different than the Prong Horn area? Why does BLM think that the currently proposed 1/8 mile buffer zone appear to be enough buffer? The surrounding area of this portion of the BLM has established homes on its boundaries, would not the same conflicts still be in place? (Individual, Redmond, OR – #52)

Response: The 1/8-mile buffer zone is a guideline for reducing mining conflicts with residents. An application must be submitted to BLM before developing a new site on BLM-administered lands. All new proposals are subject to an environmental analysis including notification of the interested and affected public and opportunities for public comment. If a site proposal is approved, guidelines and stipulations to mitigate conflicts with residents would be developed. Through this process, BLM has the discretion to require a new mineral material site to be located farther than 1/8 mile from residentially zoned areas (also see Military).

92. The RMP should give mineral material site development a higher priority relative to other uses of BLM-administered lands.

In all of the discussions related to wildlife, various recreational activities and other management objectives, the locations of specific activities, protection areas and habitats has been very critical. . . But this plan as related to mining, has provided "300,000 acres open for potential mineral use" with very little concern for where the need for material is, and for where the quality resource exists. (Oregon Dept of Transportation, Bend, OR - #261)

Also, there are numerous references to increased demand, importance of aggregate, the value of these materials, and the effect that haul distance has on viability of potential mineral sites, yet the RMP presents mineral use as adversely impacting and limiting other, presumably more important, land use opportunities. Why are land uses, such as recreation, never perceived as limiting opportunities for mineral extraction? This small issue of semantics is critical, to the overall concept of this plan. (Oregon Dept of Transportation, Bend, OR - #261)

...misconception - that the viability of mineral sites is not dependent on the site or location - prevails. This misconception has lead to the prioritization of all other land use needs above mineral sources and, as a result, opportunities for developing mineral sites

will be limited to the rare piece of land that is in no way important for any other potential land use or special interest. There is also a common misperception that cost is not as issue, as ODOT has limitless monetary resources and access to plenty of material sources. ODOT has done extensive research on potential resource areas throughout the plan area and has provided the BLM some very specific site information. Yet, the only areas that remain available for potential mineral use are in essence areas that none of the other management objectives have a specific interest in. Why are mineral resources the last priority?...the DEIS indicates that mineral material use is a recognized and valid need for these public lands, and one that is economically important to the taxpaying public. (Oregon Dept of Transportation, Bend, OR - #261)

The reality of the situation is that, throughout this planning area, the availability of economically accessible high quality aggregate materials is very scarce. "Rock" is abundant, but high quality aggregate is very limited. High quality aggregate is a much needed resource and as the population of Central Oregon grows, the demand for this resource will continue to increase. Yet through this plan, the BLM, one of the largest land owners in Central Oregon, has seemingly addressed the aggregate issue as a sidebar, allowing for mineral uses only when and if the use wouldn't directly conflict with one of the other management objectives. Let me make clear that ODOT recognizes the importance of all of the BLM's management objectives, and recognizes the difficult task that the BLM is faced with in trying to match the long term management of the public lands in Central Oregon with the demands for these lands. However, it appears that overall, the issue related to the availability of high quality aggregate and the current and future demands for this resource has not been adequately represented. As such, in our opinion, the issue of salable minerals has not been adequately addressed in this DEIS. (Oregon Dept of Transportation, Bend, OR - #261)

***Response:** A number of areas recognized as having quality mineral materials are available for site development under conditions of the PRMP. ODOT has seven potential mineral material sites in the planning area that remain or could become favorable during this planning cycle. Of those seven sites, two would not be available for development, one would require mitigation or be restricted to protect Peck's Milkvetch, and four would be available without any known special restrictions. In the Preferred Alternative, the boundary of the proposed Peck's Milkvetch ACEC was modified to make a potential mineral material site available without the restrictions imposed by the ACEC. This modification was made largely as a result of recognizing of the importance of the quality rock deposits near Cline Buttes. Recreation is not always considered a priority over mining. Allowable recreation uses in new mineral material sites will be determined through site-specific analysis that may result in restrictions on recreation or other uses to reduce conflicts with mining. Detailed demand and supply analysis is more appropriate, and would be more accurate, for site specific project analysis that is outside the scope of the Resource Management Plan.*

93. The RMP should not designate the ODOT pit at Cline Buttes as a recreational site if such designation would limit mineral extraction opportunities.

On Page 54, under Recreation, there is mention of the "ODOT Pit" and the desire for a cooperative management agreement. During the Issue Team discussions. . . I was informed by the BLM recreation specialist that this particular site would not become a "Designated Recreation Area". On Page 54 of the DEIS, there is discussion of development of a gravel parking area, loading ramps, information bulletin, ten acres of fencing and so on ...ODOT requests that this site not be considered for a designated recreational site if such a designation will limit opportunities for mineral extraction in this area ...This cinder pit, the "ODOT Site" and the ridge of rock to the west represent the only area within the Bend - Redmond - Sisters triangle that lies outside one of the numerous ACECs and other special interest areas that are off limits to mineral use, that

remains open for potential material source development. ODOT respectfully requests that the proposed improvements at this site for recreation be dropped from further consideration. (Oregon Dept of Transportation, Bend, OR - #261)

***Response:** The DEIS identifies this specific site as a future OHV play area (DEIS, Volume 2, Page 79). This site has been used by OHV enthusiasts on a regular basis for at least a decade. The FEIS does not provide specific direction on designation of this site as a play area, and instead provides a goal that BLM and ODOT cooperate on the future management of the site (and any future material sites) to provide both mineral materials and recreation opportunities. Designation of the existing site as a play area could occur in the future as part of plan implementation.*

94. The RMP should not portray recreation and mineral material operations as always being in conflict.

The Oregon Department of Transportation would like to reiterate that aggregate mining and recreation should not always be viewed as in conflict. Both uses can and frequently coexist in harmony as is discussed later in the document on Page 306, as well is other sections of the DEIS. The restrictions listed in the DEIS regarding the buffering of mineral sites from recreation sites is what creates the problem addressed above. In the interest of meeting all of the management objectives it would be our recommendation that the restrictions limiting mining in proximity to designated recreation areas be dropped. Additional language could be developed addressing some sort of mutual use concept allowing for the uses to coexist. (Oregon Dept of Transportation, Bend, OR - #261)

On Page 306, under Play Areas, it is stated that seven material sites are listed as OHV play areas, and in this same paragraph it states ""Pits are beneficial components of a larger trail system."" and "during periods of extreme fire precaution these pits provide the only OHV opportunities on public lands." These statements support the assumption that off-road vehicle use areas and mining sites are not mutually exclusive, but compatible uses. In fact, it appears that pit sites are uniquely suited for off-road vehicle use at times when the sources are inactive. Are mining and off road vehicle use truly in conflict or is this a perceived problem that really doesn't exist? . . If pits are used as play areas and shooting facilities as mentioned here and in several other areas in the DEIS why is there a restriction on mineral sites in proximity to recreation sites and trail systems? It seems that mining, shooting and OHV uses are compatible with management. (Oregon Dept of Transportation, Bend, OR - #261)

On Page 54, under Recreation, there is mention of the "ODOT Pit" and the desire for a cooperative management agreement. During the Issue Team discussions...I was informed by the BLM recreation specialist that this particular site would not become a "Designated Recreation Area". On Page 54 of the DEIS, there is discussion of development of a gravel parking area, loading ramps, information bulletin, ten acres of fencing and so on . . . ODOT requests that this site not be considered for a designated recreational site if such a designation will limit opportunities for mineral extraction in this area(Oregon Dept of Transportation, Bend, OR - #261)

This cinder pit, the "ODOT Site" and the ridge of rock to the west represent the only area within the Bend - Redmond - Sisters triangle that lies outside one of the numerous ACECs and other special interest areas that are off limits to mineral use, that remains open for potential material source development. (Oregon Dept of Transportation, Bend, OR - #261)

ODOT respectfully requests that the proposed improvements at this site for recreation be dropped from further consideration. (Oregon Dept of Transportation, Bend, OR - #261)

Response: The RMP does not consider recreation and mining to always be in conflict. A footnote to Table 2-12 (page 85 in Volume 2 of the DEIS) states, "Designated recreation sites that depend upon or exist in mineral material pits generally will not be considered to be in conflict with mining operations for the purposes of setting up a buffer zone." This language has been added to the text in the FEIS.

95. The RMP should present the framework for conflict and demand factors and stipulations for mineral material sales.

On Page xxvi, Management Direction Common to Alternatives 2 through 7, the reader is directed to Table ES-2 which shows up on Page xxxiii. Under the Minerals section of Table ES-2 it states: "Establish a framework for considering conflict and demand factors?" Is this framework for conflicts clearly presented somewhere in the DEIS? If not, where is this framework documented? Again in Table ES-2, a similar comment relates to the second statement under Minerals, where it says "Establish stipulations for salable mineral use?" Within the text of the DEIS are these stipulations clearly presented? If not, where are the established stipulations documented? (Oregon Dept of Transportation, Bend, OR - #261)

Again in Table ES-2, a similar comment relates to the second statement under Minerals, where it says "Establish stipulations for saleable mineral use?" Within the text of the DEIS are these stipulations clearly presented? If not, where are the established stipulations documented? (Oregon Dept of Transportation, Bend, OR - #261)

Response: The framework for considering conflict and demand factors is presented in Table 2-12 on page 85 and the stipulations for saleable mineral use are presented on page 86 (both page numbers are from Volume 2 of the DEIS and Chapter 2 of the FEIS).

96. The RMP should more clearly state the meaning and application of "discretionary closures."

In the last paragraph on the bottom of Page 449, it states "Exclusion areas, avoidance areas, and other restrictions may add costs to the mining industry and add cumulatively to other present and future restrictions." Based on previous references to "Discretionary Closures" related to mining, ODOT would ask that "Discretionary Closures" be added to this list of restrictions. (Oregon Dept of Transportation, Bend, OR - #261)

...With these "Discretionary Closures" looming, it is difficult to determine what is actually available for potential use. Please explain in the EIS how, with the possibility of these seemingly arbitrary closures, can the BLM ensure that there will be sufficient public land available for mineral uses and that the regional aggregate needs discussed on page 551 of the DEIS will be met? (Oregon Dept of Transportation, Bend, OR - #261)

Under the "Goals and Management Direction Common to All Alternatives" on Page 52, under Minerals, the first bullet, it says "'Where not withdrawn from mineral entry or under discretionary closure.'" Discretionary Closure is not defined in the glossary. In looking further through the DEIS it appears that Discretionary Closures are somewhat defined on Page 297. In this location it seems to indicate that a Discretionary Closure is a management decision to close lands, but criteria used to make that decision are not presented. Could you please define Discretionary Closures in the Glossary? Also, please describe the criteria used to make closure decisions and the thresholds that would warrant a discretionary closure. (Oregon Dept of Transportation, Bend, OR - #261)

Throughout the DEIS it appears that mineral extraction is the only land use subject to discretionary closures. If that is true, please explain why. If other land uses are indeed subject to discretionary closures, please describe those in the EIS. (Oregon Dept of Transportation, Bend, OR - #261)

Response: The use of the term “discretionary closures” has been dropped from the FEIS due to the confusion caused by use of this term. This language change does not alter or modify any of the land allocations available for mineral development. Closures to mineral material site development are defined through the planning process; any further closures not identified in this plan would require a plan amendment.

97. The RMP should clarify how BLM will meet the demand for mineral materials while mitigating conflicts with residents, recreation, and natural resource management objectives.

On Page 85 under Minerals, there is the following statement “Common to Alternative 2-7 would meet the increasing demand for mineral materials while reducing mining conflict with recreation, residents, natural resources and other management objectives.” The DEIS does not provide sufficient support for this statement. Please explain how the Upper Deschutes Resource Management Plan will allow for the increasing demand for minerals to be met, while reducing the mining conflicts with these other uses. (Oregon Dept of Transportation, Bend, OR - #261)

Page 551, first paragraph ...[states] “BLM anticipates accommodating ODOT annual aggregate needs of 135,000 cubic yards in all alternatives. This analysis also assumes that the cost savings are “returned” to the region by additional roadway construction that ODOT would otherwise not be able to fund in the region.” Please explain how the BLM estimated ODOT’s annual aggregate needs at 135,000 cubic yards ...The concept of “returned” savings is valid, but there is no assurance that the region would particularly benefit. ODOT works with a statewide budget and savings can apply regionally or statewide. The main concern with the ...statement ...from Page 551 is the assumption that the BLM will accommodate ODOT’s annual aggregate needs. Yet on Page 453 in the second full paragraph the following statement is made: “Depending on the location, restrictions and closures could restrict or make some sites unavailable and may have the indirect effect of requiring the ODOT and other users or mineral materials to utilize alternative sources to meet demand.” These two statements seem to be in direct conflict and ODOT requests clarification on this issue. Will the proposed RMP ensure that the BLM will be able to accommodate ODOT’s annual aggregate needs or not? (Oregon Dept of Transportation, Bend, OR - #261)

On page 453 there are several indications that mineral sites will be subject to restrictions and closures, yet on page 551 there is a statement that BLM anticipates meeting ODOT’s annual aggregate needs (135,000 cubic yards). BLM appears to have a clear understanding of the economic importance of publicly available mineral sources. However, is it possible that these limitations or closures could impact BLM’s ability to meet ODOT’s annual aggregate needs? Also, it appears that the RMP mineral allocation has been made on an acreage basis (page 52 indicates that all alternatives will allow for 396,185 acres for locatable mineral entry and 366,640 for mineral leasing). Is the BLM confident that it will be able to provide the needed annual volume (135,000 cubic yards) of quality rock within that acreage? (Oregon Department of Transportation, Bend, OR - #295)

Response: It is the BLM’s objective to meet ODOT’s demand while mitigating conflicts with residents, recreation, and other management objectives. Although the BLM intends to be responsive to mineral demand, it is possible that the demand will not be met due to conflicts and resource concerns. This clarification has been made in the FEIS.